

City Council Meeting Minutes

**April 5, 2016
City Hall, Council Chambers
749 Main Street
7:00 PM**

Call to Order – Mayor Pro Tem Lipton called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Roll Call was taken and the following members were present:

City Council: ***Mayor Pro Tem Lipton, City Council members: Ashley Stolzmann, Dennis Maloney, Chris Leh, Susan Loo and Jay Keany (arrives 9:00 pm)***

Absent: ***Mayor Muckle***

Staff Present: ***Malcolm Fleming, City Manager
Heather Balser, Deputy City Manager
Kevin Watson, Finance Director
Aaron DeJong, Director of Economic Development
and Interim Planning & Building Safety Director
Scott Robinson, Planner II
Kurt Kowar, Public Works Director
Joe Stevens, Parks and Recreation Director
Kathy Martin, Recreation Superintendent
Alan Gill, Projects Manager
Carol Hanson, Acting City Clerk***

Others Present: ***Sam Light, City Attorney***

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All rose for the pledge of allegiance.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton called for changes to the agenda and hearing none, Council member Stolzmann moved to approve the agenda, seconded by Council member Maloney. All were in favor. Absent: Mayor Muckle and Council member Keany

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

No comments.

APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton called for changes to the consent agenda. Council member Loo asked for a phrase in the minutes on page 10 to be re-worded to not sound like she saw an upside to project cost increases. She will work with Acting City Clerk Hanson to make the correction. Council member Leh moved to approve the consent agenda with the change to the minutes, seconded by Council member Maloney. All in favor.

Absent: Mayor Muckle and Council member Keany

- A. *Approval of the Bills***
- B. *Approval of Minutes: March 15, 2016***
- C. *Approval of 2016 Humane Society Animal Impoundment Agreement***
- D. *Approve Arbor Day Proclamation***
- E. *Approve Resolution No. 16, Series 2016 – A Resolution Approving an Agreement for Delegation of Activities for a Boulder County Collaborative CDBG-DR Sub-Allocation for the City of Louisville Raw Water Diversion improvements Project***

COUNCIL INFORMATIONAL COMMENTS ON PERTINENT ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

No comments.

CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

City Manager Fleming thanked everyone for their patience with all the construction around town. He noted County Road Bridge construction is underway. He realized parking in downtown is difficult and noted paving of the parking lot near Lucky Pie will proceed when the area dries out.

REGULAR BUSINESS

PRESENTATION – CITIZENS FOR FINISHING FASTRACKS

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton called for the presentation.

Council member Stolzmann introduced Karen Benker and Joan Peck, members of Citizens for Finishing FasTracks. Ms. Peck is currently on the Longmont City Council and Ms. Benker previously served on the Longmont City Council and the RTD Board of Directors.

Joan Peck, 1935 Spruce Avenue, Longmont, CO discussed FasTracks lack of progress in the Northwest Corridor and felt since the taxpayers are paying for a rail line, it needs to be built. Ms. Peck noted Longmont passed a resolution to encourage RTD to finish the northwest corridor.

Ms. Peck addressed the Northwest Area Mobility Study (NAMS) and some of the myths surrounding the build out of the corridor including;

1. Ridership numbers are not there to warrant building the northwest corridor – there are questions around how those numbers were calculated,
2. BNSF railroad will not work with us, - BNSF was frustrated with FasTracks and RTD not having a solid plan,
3. There is no money – RTD budget is flexible and dollars could be moved into the FasTracks budget.

She asked Louisville City Council to come up with a resolution and a letter to ask Boulder County to put the northwest corridor ahead of any busses planned.

Karen Benker, 1919 Andrew Alden St., Longmont, CO noted her familiarity with government budgeting. Eleven years of sales tax dollars have gone into the fund without any benefit of rail. Citizen's for Finishing FasTracks started going over the financial assumptions. The NAMS study suggested to Boulder County there was no money for the rail line until 2040. Tax collection has gone up since the study was done and projections now show a surplus starting in 2020. She wanted to remind citizens of Boulder County they are paying the tax and should be getting a rail line. Federal funding could be sought through the Small Starts program. RTD reports they are paying off the bonds for the other rail lines faster than projected and still have \$150 million of bonding authority. She wants to start a conversation to form a coalition to be heard by RTD. She asked Louisville City Council to pass a resolution, talk to the Chamber of Commerce, prompt DRCOG awareness and talk to the Boulder County Commissioners. She described the contact information for the Citizens for Finishing FasTracks Coalition.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton thanked the representatives for the presentation.

Council member Stolzmann thanked Ms. Peck and Ms. Benker and noted the voters have made it clear they want FasTracks. She asked to direct staff to come back with a resolution and letter to the County Commissioners.

City Attorney Light suggested staff direction could be done under item 10 to identify future agenda items.

RECREATION CENTER/SENIOR CENTER AND AQUATIC CENTER EXPANSION – SURVEY RESULTS

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton noted the Task force has been working hard along with the consultant team. The Task Force wants to provide periodic updates to City Council beginning with this presentation.

Parks and Recreation Director Stevens outlined the three parts of the Council Communication; the review of the survey results, the programmatic element derived with the help of the citizen task force and the tax implications. He introduced two members of the consulting team from Sink Comb Dethlefs (SCD), Hillary Andren-Wise and Chris Kastelic. He noted members of the Task Force were in attendance.

Chris Kastelic noted he would be presenting survey results for Council consideration.

Introduction - The purpose of this study was to gather statistically valid public feedback on the Louisville Recreation/Senior Center and Memory Square swimming pool. This survey research effort and subsequent analysis were designed to assist the City of Louisville and Sink Combs Dethlefs in creating an architectural plan to renovate, improve, and expand existing recreational facilities and services.

Methodology – 3 primary methods used to conduct survey;

1. Online, invitation only web survey
2. Online, open-link public survey
3. Online, open link survey emailed to the rec center's member contact list

Paper surveys were also available upon request.

List purchased for invitation sample mailing and 4000 surveys mailed out to a random sample of Louisville residents in February 2016.

- 690 responses – 15% (up from the projected 10%) – with about 3.7% margin of error.

Demographic Profile – closely resembles the make-up of the City

- Relatively even gender split
- Fairly affluent (66% earn \$100,000 per year)

Household Profile – Half of the respondents live in households with children (51%) and roughly ¼ are empty nesters (27%)

Weekly Usage of Facilities

- Only 19% of respondents do not use the rec center at all, but there are major differences in the reported use of facilities (i.e., weights/cardio vs. Senior Center)
- Top amenities used: weights/cardio, indoor track, lap swimming

Rec Center Usage Preferences – Crowding, lack of facilities, amenities, and poor equipment topped the list of reasons why people aren't using the rec center.

Memory Square usage preferences – Crowding, hours of operation, and lack of facilities, amenities topped the list of reasons why people aren't using Memory Square.

Importance of Rec Center Facilities- New fitness areas, Fitzone group areas, lap swimming, exercise/lesson pool, leisure/water park and locker room facilities topped the list of importance. Racquetball and wood floor gymnasium were at the bottom of the list while a multi-activity center gym was near the middle of the list.

Allocation of \$100 – if you had \$100 to spend on recreation facilities how would you spend it?

- Respondents allocate most to weights/cardio (\$13), seasonal outdoor aquatics (\$12), and group exercise room (\$11)

Importance of Rec Center Facilities – Aquatics

- Importance ratings for aquatic facilities very similar

Importance of Rec Center Facilities – Aquatics by respondent age

- Younger respondents rate indoor leisure pool, new seasonal outdoor aquatics facility as more important
- Older respondents prefer warm water aquatic exercise/lesson pool

Importance of Rec Center Facilities – Gym

- Fitness areas, Exercise rooms, running track, multi-activity gym rose to higher priority

Importance of Rec Center Facilities – Youth

- Youth amenities rated as somewhat less important

Importance of Senior Center Facilities

- Seniors' priorities match up with overall priorities

Importance of Memory Square Facilities

- Many improvements to memory Square were identified as relatively important

No Additional Facilities Needed – 91% of respondents felt some improvement is needed

Opinion on Increasing Taxes – A majority of respondents (83%) support a city tax increase for recreation improvements

- by age, gender and presence of children in household; middle aged respondents, females, and respondents with kids are more likely to support an increased tax

Tax amount willing to Pay – About half of respondents (48%) would support an increase of \$100 per year or less

Impact of Fees on Participation – A majority (64%) said fee increases would not affect their ability to participate

Follow-up Survey –

- The City will issue a follow up telephone survey in summer 2016 to registered voters with further financial analysis
- Open Houses will also occur as the design is developed

COUNCIL COMMENTS

Council member Maloney asked about the second survey questions. Deputy City Manager Balser noted the second survey would address the financial piece once the cost is better identified and what people would support for the dollar value.

Council member Leh asked about the timeline. Deputy City Manager Balser said there would be two ballot questions, one for the capital bonding and one for the operation and maintenance. Ballot language would have to be ready for approval mid-July, so everything would have to be completed before then.

Council member Stolzmann noted she had asked for a cross tabulation for the 20% of people who didn't use the rec center and there were no significant differences.

PRESENTATION CONTINUES

When the Task Force was presented with the survey and findings, they formed a list of recommendations. Trends included improving crowded fitness areas with exercise areas, expanding the track, multi-activity gym, finding ways to improve the aquatics amenities, expanding youth, child sitting and preschool and a better senior center environment.

Preliminary Conceptual Program/Cost Summary was presented totaling \$25,162,156. The Task Force will now look at each amenity and try to determine which are the most viable and have the most benefit, and meet the program expectations according to the survey.

Council will continue to be periodically updated as all of the pieces of the project come together in anticipation of potentially placing a tax issue on the 2016 ballot.

COUNCIL COMMENT

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton understood the interest from the public meetings in outdoor aquatic facilities. That infrastructure is expensive so the design team has been asked to provide designs to tie an indoor pool to outdoor space. This combination would provide use of the pool for 12 months. He felt the proposed changes work well within the budget constraints and provide much of what the survey showed as desired amenities.

Chris Kastelic noted this proposes to take the 57,000 square foot facility and add 40,000 square feet of improvements.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton asked Finance Director Watson to describe the estimated debt service and tax impacts for the proposed bond issue chart included in the packet. Finance Director Watson noted a range of project funding requirements was taken from \$25 million to \$37 million, conservative bond issuance costs of 1.5% to get a total debt amount. The sales tax rate to support the annual debt service was looked at as well as the property tax mill levy to support the debt service. A calculation of what the net mill levy would be was made, which was the new levy less the library levy which expires in 2018. The \$25 million dollar project, results in about a 2.941 mill levy, which is about \$120 on a \$500,000 residence and \$425 on a business valued at \$500,000. He wanted it understood these are very rough estimates.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton noted there is work being done with the City's financial advisor to examine all the factors to get a clearer vision of the impact on residents. There will also be analysis if the project could be started in 2017 to avoid some of the inflation for construction costs.

Council member Maloney asked about the two year overlap of the Library and proposed Rec Center loans.

Deputy City Manager Balser emphasized the question in November would be for a new tax at the full amount regardless of what is happening with the Library. Finance Director Watson noted the financing may include a wraparound structure.

Council member Loo cautioned against using an exact \$25 million number; it is a preliminary figure.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton called for public comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mike Frontczak, 643 Fairfield Lane, Louisville, CO asked if there was a tie between the arboretum and what is being done at the rec center.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton said it had not, but could be looked at to include the arboretum in the campus.

Michael Perkins, 229 Vulcan St, Louisville, CO asked about the tax structure for high density residential. Mayor Pro Tem Lipton noted it would be on assessed value.

Scott Beard, 512 Buckthorn Lane, Louisville, CO asked if the rec center operates with a revenue stream that creates profit or was it cost center; would it support itself.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton noted it was supported both from the general fund and user fees. Parks and Recreation Director Stevens noted in 2015 the Recreation Center generated approximately 2 million dollars in the recreation division and the operating was approximately 2.7 million dollars. Determining what to ask for in fees and what to ask for in additional taxes is part of the process.

John Leary, 1116 LaFarge Ave., Louisville, CO cautioned separating registered voters and taxpayers when conducting the second survey and not using it for election strategy.

COUNCIL COMMENT

Council member Stolzmann thanked the Task Force members and public for their participation. She asked for a history of the preschool at the rec center.

Kathy Martin, Superintendent of Recreation and Senior Services, stated about 18 years ago the rec center had an early learning center not required to have a State license. Shortly after the program began notification from the State alerted them they needed to be licensed, so they began the process and have been licensed as a preschool for about 16 years.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton met with the school district concerning preschool. Boulder Valley indicated they plan to expand pre-school offerings. So the question becomes, what does that mean for the City's facility. The facility could be re-designed if the pre-school becomes no longer feasible.

Council member Stolzmann asked about preserving the historic structure at Memory Square, if public art was included to enhance the recreation experience, and sustainability. Chris Kastelic noted public art is integral to the design and usually 1% is dedicated. Sustainability was not called out because it is integral to the building. In looking at the existing building versus the new, the net result could be the new construction could offset the old for a no net energy use.

Council member Stolzmann asked if incorporating a disguised cell tower could be included. It was noted it could be investigated.

Council member Stolzmann asked about including the Arboretum in the plan, especially when looking at parking, to make it look like one facility

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton thanked the members of the Task Force and noted the work will continue.

RESOLUTION NO. 17, SERIES 2016 – A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE SOUTH BOULDER ROAD SMALL AREA PLAN

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton called for a staff presentation.

Planner II Robinson presented the draft South Boulder Road small area plan. The Comprehensive Plan approved in 2013 calls for development of guidelines of areas in the city. The South Boulder Road small area plan is one of those areas to be translated into zoning and design guidelines to control what is built in the corridor.

The small area plan:

1. Defines land uses for the corridor
2. Establishes preferred physical character (design guidelines)
3. Outlines public infrastructure priorities.

The Project started with a kick-off meeting in October of 2014, then 3 public workshops and the draft plan was reviewed by City Council in a recent study session.

Project Principles were based on public input and endorsed by Planning Commission and City Council last year.

Community Design was based on input heard, desire for places to go and places to stay, the desire to get around and get to, creating a sense of community across the major corridors and getting development that contributes. Place-making concepts were looked at; design issues to incorporate into the design guidelines after the plan is adopted. Transitional streets, pedestrian refuges to make it more pleasant and safer to walk along major corridors, views into the community, creating parking easy to traverse and not unsightly.

Allowed land uses will be maintained. The focus will be on design to make it compatible with the community. A few street improvements are recommended, some new streets, some new private connections to create connections in developments or across developments, and a few new intersections including a potential one at South Boulder Road and Kaylix or Cannon Circle.

To make it easier to walk along South Boulder Road where there is additional right of way, the recommendation is to expand the sidewalk and enhance the landscaping. Where that is not possible the plan looks at having parallel connections. To cross South Boulder Road, underpasses were talked about. The plan calls for an underpass near Via Appia at Cottonwood Park and a desire for an underpass at Main Street was heard. Between the right of way constraints and utilities, staff does not believe it is feasible with the direction received from Council not to pursue the re-alignment of Main Street. Two underpasses are in the works, under the railroad track near Steel Ranch and under Highway 42 near the new Kestrel development. Roadway improvements are being looked at to make it more pedestrian friendly.

The location of allowed heights: Buildings along South Boulder Road and Hwy 42/96th Street should be primarily one story with a second story allowed under specific conditions. Further back from the corridor buildings should be a maximum of two stories with a third story allowed conditionally.

Urban design elements address if the property was to be redeveloped; what it could look like. Elements include 10-20 foot setbacks, variety of building styles, creating views in the corridor without a consistent street wall, active pedestrian plazas, creating connections into and through the development for both pedestrians and traffic, varied building designs and heights.

The 2013 Comprehensive Plan update calls for positive fiscal impacts from the South Boulder Road area. A broad net total fiscal impact projects over a twenty year cumulative, a net positive fiscal impact of about 12 million dollars. Implementation includes drafting and adopting the design standards and guidelines to control development. Public improvements include some City responsibility, some that private property owners or developers would be primarily responsible for and some that would be a partnership. There is a projected timeline and rough cost ranges and estimates.

Rezoning should only be considered if:

- The land to be rezoned was zoned in error and is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan
- The area is changing and it is in the public interest to encourage redevelopment
- Necessary to provide land for a community-related use

Special Review Use

- Consistent with spirit and intent of the Comp Plan, not contrary to general welfare of City and neighborhood
- Lend economic stability compatible with character of surrounding area
- Internal efficiency for residents, recreation, public access, safety, utilities, and other factors related to public health and convenience
- External effects including traffic, nuisances, litter, and other effects on public health, welfare, safety and convenience
- Adequate pedestrian facilities to prevent use of vehicular ways

Proposed Height Criteria

- Overall design
- Enhancements to public realm
- Limited impacts on views from surrounding properties
- Limited impacts of shadows on surrounding properties

The small area plan if adopted as written, reduces the amount of development that could occur in the corridor in comparison to what existing zoning currently allows at maximum buildout.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton asked about what was meant by development potential. Planner Robinson noted it was based on existing zoning, not assuming waivers for additional height or additional density. Where special review use may be allowed, it looked at areas where it is already approved and would maintain existing use; areas where

special review use could be approved but has not, would maintain uses compatible with uses allowed by right. It does not anticipate any new Special Review Use approvals.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton called for Council Comment.

COUNCIL COMMENT

Council member Maloney asked of the proposed allowed; how many are unconstructed with entitlements. Planner Robinson did not have a specific list. Council member Leh suggested the answer be included in the next presentation. Planner Robinson agreed.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton called for public comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT

John Leary, 1116 LaFarge Avenue, Louisville, CO outlined five premises for a recommendation. When Council first saw this small area plan, the decision was made for no additional high density housing. Comp Plan and small area plan create the vision for the corridor. Louisville Municipal Code makes it clear the use of Special Review Use (SRU) has to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. If you can't deny the SRU process, the next phase of the process is zoning. Zoning can be changed and vision can be changed. It was important to understand nothing was irreversible. Certainty needs to come from the Comp Plan for residents along the corridor. He recommended removing residential/SRU designation from the Comp Plan and insert language to clearly indicate the vision for the corridor. This doesn't interfere with the beneficial use of SRU elsewhere in the corridor.

Sid Vinall, 544 Leader Circle, Louisville, CO has followed the small area plan and noted it is an important plan along South Boulder Road. The area needs to look like a corridor that is welcoming to people who pass through. He felt the plan has some attractive elements. The north part of Louisville has had residential development; he would like to see more retail. He supported the Via Appia underpass and would like to see one at Main Street or at least enhancements to the crossing. He stated the Baptist Church area could be a nice open area. He liked the design for Village Square although heights seem to overpower. North Main gateway could be an open and grassy area. Improve the connectivity; do not divide areas of town.

Alice Srinivasan, 565 Fireside Street, Louisville, CO stated it is difficult to cross South Boulder Road at Main Street and wanted to see it more pedestrian friendly. She was concerned about the high density housing and wondered if there was infrastructure to support it.

James Williams, 1889 Garfield Ave., Louisville, CO wanted to speak about the trail improvements, specifically underpasses. He felt the theme in this process was connectivity across South Boulder Road. The project's first principle speaks to safe and

convenient crossing of South Boulder Road. He asked what funding was allocated to the two underpasses already in the works.

City Manager Fleming noted for the Steel Ranch underpass, Takoda development contributed \$200,000 dollars with an estimated \$500,000 cost at the time, now with design additions to accommodate stormwater, it is estimated at more than \$1 million dollars. He did not recall the Kestrel contribution to the Hwy. 42 underpass.

Mr. Williams asked why the timeline for the Via Appia underpass had been pushed out. The answer was fiscal constraints.

Mr. Williams suggested building out from the core of the area to create the connectivity planned. Traffic along South Boulder Road is only increasing and he encouraged additional consideration to move the Via Appia underpass up in the timeline. He noted there was a petition signed by Louisville residents expressing a preference to include the underpass at Via Appia in the 1-5 year planning.

- Keany arrives 9:00 PM

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton noted the Capital Improvement Plan is reviewed every year and if the opportunity arises Council could move the timeline up.

Sherry Sommer, 910 S. Palisade Ct., Louisville, CO heard two goals of the plan she thought sounded very good. First, it is meant to control development according to community desires and second, it is intended to maintain existing zoning. She felt the allowance for third story and provision for the SRU did not contribute to these goals.

Jean Morgan, 1131 Spruce St., Louisville, CO felt if a change was as large as the residential buildings north of Alfalfa's, it should go through re-zoning not SRU. She asked for more study of the feasibility for a safer crossing in the Main Street area. She felt the area at Main and Centennial on the south side of South Boulder Road would be a nice place for a pioneer park.

Cindy Bedell, 662 W. Willow St., Louisville, CO noted South Boulder Road is a traffic mess and is only going to get worse with what is approved and already under construction. She wanted to mitigate traffic impact by not allowing any high density housing through SRU and limiting office density and keeping them to one story. Bringing buildings out to South Boulder Road has blocked ability to widen the road. She asked Council to keep quality of life of residents in mind when considering the vision for the area.

Janet Stonington, 1101 Grant Ave., Louisville, CO echoed Jean Morgan's comments. She handed out flyers to get folks interested in this meeting and noted all of the people she contacted were concerned about crowding in Louisville.

Peter Stewart, 1132 Jefferson Ave., Louisville, CO said this discussion reminded him of the first Safeway re-development proposal to change to all residential which surprised neighbors. He noted the opportunity of the small area plan to define community desires. He supported further definition of those community desires.

Darlene Nahodyl, 2333 Dogwood Circle, Louisville, CO asked why most of the plans presented from the Planning Commission seem to contain an escape clause around the issue at hand. She felt the Special Review Use provided a way to get around what the community wants and or said they did not want. The public wants to have their voice heard about what is to be built.

Michael Perkins, 229 Vulcan St., Louisville, CO considered the Village Square area vital to North Louisville. He was disconcerted by the high density development. He didn't consider Louisville an urban area. He cautioned against losing parking in Village Square as parking is already difficult.

Alex Bradley, 1385 Caledonia Circle, Louisville, CO felt the SRU process was a loophole. She didn't understand why it was allowed. She was concerned about the lack of safe crossings for the children who attend Louisville Middle School. She was perplexed why the light at Kaylix was being considered. She asked for clarification on how the currently allowed residential was more than the small area plan proposes.

John Nahodyl,, 2333 Dogwood Circle, Louisville, CO noted he has involved in transportation and architecture all his life. He felt citizens don't have a chance to present other ideas when developers present theirs. He didn't want the SRU's to be a runaround to the zoning process. He encouraged Council to pursue the Northwest Corridor Rail.

Carlos Hernandez, 279 Chestnut Street, Louisville, CO noted he lived in high density housing when he first moved to Louisville and was thankful it was available at the time so he could be part of this community.

Debby Fahey, 1118 W. Enclave Circle, Louisville, CO agreed with much of what was said. She saw connectivity as what citizens wanted on South Boulder Road and having an underpass ten years out was not sufficient. She encouraged putting in a safe way to cross soon. She felt the property rights of the people who already live here, based on zoning that was already there, should be maintained.

Beth Kearns, 371 Eisenhower Drive, Louisville, CO wanted to keep the quality of life and difference Louisville provides. She was not in favor of a blinking light at crossings.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton called for Council questions of staff.

COUNCIL QUESTIONS

Council member Loo asked if Centennial and Main had been approved to be connected, would there be room for an underpass.

Planner Robinson noted it would depend on what land was acquired and how it was realigned.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton asked to show on the map the Main Street underpass constraint.

Planner Robinson noted the main issue was providing accessibility; slopes, ramp access, getting back up to grade with limited space. Safety concerns include sight lines and if dark, people won't use it and end up with the same concerns.

Council member Loo asked about other alternatives including an overpass; do you end up with accessibility issues there as well. Planner Robinson responded, yes, there would have to be elevators or ramps and the limited space would be an issue. The City would have to acquire land to put in the underpass. The proposal in the plan is to make intersection improvements, roadway improvements and signal improvements, to make it safer to cross at grade. The dollar projection for the Main Street crossing is between \$100 – 500 thousand dollars.

Council member Stolzmann wanted to further investigate a crossing at Main Street.

Council member Leh asked about discussion with the property owners at Main and South Boulder Road. Planner Robinson said during preliminary discussions concerning the realignment of Main Street those homeowners spoke strongly against it and were not interested in any sort of land negotiations.

Council member Leh thought citizen desire exists for a crossing with safety and connectivity. He encouraged more study.

Council member Loo asked for a brief history on the Loftus/Safeway project and whether it was a SRU process. Planner Robinson noted the property was zoned Commercial Community (CC) which allows multi-family residential as a special review use. The residential got scaled down after the first proposal and more commercial was added before final approval.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton asked about the light between the railroad tracks and Hwy 42.

Planner Robinson noted it was to provide a way to cross South Boulder Road without going out to Hwy 42. He stated there are drawbacks and advantages, allows citizens and businesses to cross but can add additional delay. It was left in the plan for consideration in the future.

Council member Stolzmann noted the crosswalk at Griffith and Hwy. 42 and suggested the signal go there as well. Planner Robinson noted the light at Cannon Circle and the crosswalk at Griffith are part of Hwy 42 plan and could be looked at again.

Council member Stolzmann noted the plan closed off many left turns crossing South Boulder Road and asked about Blue Star Lane and the call for taking the median out. Planner Robinson said the left turn at Blue Star was determined to have better traffic flow and visibility was better. He noted the changing of the median was 11-20 years out.

Council member Stolzmann asked why the plan calls out residential SRU on the commercial properties, but no other type of SRU. Planner Robinson noted this plan tries to keep the uses in broad categories. The zoning code will be specified later.

Council member Stolzmann asked City Attorney Light if commercial uses were what was wanted, would this be the place to list that.

City Attorney Light stated the primary purpose of this document is to list the vision desired. To implement it in a regulatory way, that mandates only certain uses be allowed in a different way than the current zoning is able, then a subsequent legislative process to amend the zoning ordinance would need to take place. For the Comprehensive Plan to carry regulatory weight if you don't adopt subsequent ordinances, then the Comp Plan needs to be specific so people understand what is expected.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton called for public comment and hearing none, closed public comments and asked for Council comments.

COUNCIL COMMENTS

Council member Maloney thanked staff for their work on the plan. As he looked at this draft small area plan, he found some of the designs attractive and liked the idea of the area being multi-modal. Traffic is busy and needs to be addressed now and for the future. Density in the area doesn't make a lot of sense. Community desire is not for housing density in the area. The SRU areas should support retail and commercial. Fiscal model is solid, but the assumptions for the amount of spending on taxable goods across income brackets didn't make sense. Cost assumptions on the underpass need to be more specific. An underpass at Via Appia is a good idea, but at Main St. seems to make more sense.

Council member Stolzmann supported Council member Maloney's comments. She wanted to add the Main street underpass. She referred to page 174 showing two-way traffic to the Main Street apartments, but the community was told that would not be two-way traffic. A better solution would be when Christopher Plaza redevelops, look at a way to combine the driveways. Blue Star Lane should stay the same. Remove lights on Cannon Circle, too close together; explore traffic signal at Griffith. Keep one entrance at Cottonwood Park and move to east. She thanked staff for their work on the plan.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton commended staff and the public for the work on this plan. He felt it is important to embrace the plan and bring this to some level of closure soon. Realize this evolves over the years and is fine-tuned as time passes. He wanted to give property owners assurance of where the City is headed. Have to recognize existing property rights and entitlements. High density residential is not desired in this area or even retail and commercial not already planned. Safe connectivity needs to be explored.

Council member Keany apologized for being late to the meeting. He expressed concern over some of the traffic signals and wanted to see better pedestrian access at Main Street. He didn't want the SRU process to become a wholesale zoning tool. When looking at entitlements or existing zoning should be looking at what is already there and not zoning or allowing more growth in the future, especially residential.

Council member Loo thanked Planning staff and realized it is tough to balance all the voices heard. The political climate in Louisville seems to be trending toward slow or no growth. The SRU process worked in the Safeway re-development, the community was heard and the project approved was very different than the one originally proposed. The fear of the SRU process is unfounded. Not doing the realignment at Main Street and South Boulder Road was a process of Council listening to citizens. That closed some of the options for an underpass and overpass. She was not in favor of so many stoplights. The stoplight on Highway 42 at Griffith or Cannon was a CDOT issue. Funding the underpass at Via Appia was moved out to use the funds for paving the roads. She reassured the public, staff and Council are always looking for outside funding. She was not in favor of adding height in the South Boulder Road area.

Council member Leh thanked the public for attending and providing comments. He thanked staff and Council for their work. He noted most of his concerns had already been mentioned. He wanted to explore the underpass and see if there weren't ways to move it forward in the plan. He appreciated the positive comment about high density housing. He noted the SRU process is a land use tool and provides for changes of land use with requirements. Staff, Planning Commission and Council reviews the requirements before a decision is made. The process is a tool and is beneficial when used properly.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton gave staff direction:

- Additional study and review on connectivity, crossings, and safety
- Residential land use – interest in regulating any additional high density
- Height – density for retail and commercial limit to 1-2 story or is there some latitude for three – if three watch visual impact, set back from roadways and residential buffer. Refine map
- Limit Special Review Use (SRU)
- Bring back rationale on the traffic signals

Council members discussed whether the small area plan needed to be more specific in these areas before approval.

City Attorney Light noted if Council includes no more multi-family dwellings as a vision in the Comp Plan, the Code still says those dwellings are an SRU in those zone districts. Options for some Code changes would be brought to Council.

City Manager Fleming noted the concern over the SRU process. He asked Planner Robinson to address the concern over the number of stories allowed. Planner Robinson noted three stories are allowed in most of the corridor now, this small area plan would allow one story by right along South Boulder Road and Highway 42, and through an additional design review process (not SRU), potential for a second story and further back allow for the potential of a third story. The amount of development along the corridor is reduced by reducing the amount of height.

MOTION

Lipton moved to continue consideration of Resolution No. 17, Series 2016 to the next meeting on April 19, 2016. Council member Maloney seconded. All in favor.

BIENNIAL BUDGET PROCESS AND FIRST REVIEW/DIRECTION ON 2017/2018 CONTRIBUTING PROJECTS

City Manager Fleming noted there had been some question if staff was doing a biennial budget and said each Director has put together a list of contributing projects that cover both years. This concept list is designed to solicit feedback from City Council primarily if there is something Council would like to see on the list and it is not currently there. If there is something on the list Council does not want time spent on, let staff know and they can remove it. Some items will drop off since it is likely there will not be financial or staff resources for everything.

City Manager Fleming asked this be discussed at a future meeting.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton asked staff to schedule time for Council discussion of the biennial budget process.

CITY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

No report.

COUNCIL COMMENTS, COMMITTEE REPORTS, AND IDENTIFICATION OF FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Council member Stolzmann asked staff be directed to bring back a resolution to RTD similar to Longmont's in support of finishing Fastracks and draft a letter to the Boulder

County Commissioners saying Louisville thinks completing the Northwest Corridor Rail line is a priority for the area. Mayor Pro Tem Lipton asked staff to bring those back. Council member Loo asked for some background, history and analysis by staff.

Deputy City Manager noted the Mayors and Commissioners Coalition has done some analysis within the last six to twelve months and staff could gather what is available for Council review.

Council member Loo wanted background so there was no conflict with what had been done in the past. Mayor Pro Tem Lipton agreed there should be an alignment as to what has been done in the past.

ADJOURN

MOTION: Mayor Pro Tem Lipton moved for adjournment, seconded by Council member Leh . All were in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 11:17 p.m.

Jeffrey Lipton, Mayor Pro Tem

Carol Hanson, Acting City Clerk